Himco Dump Superfund Site
Proposed Plan Technical Meeting
March 16, 2004

Meeting Minutes

The following provides minutes of the Himco Dump Superfund Proposed Plan Technical team meeting held on March 16, 2004 at the U.S. EPA Region 5 office in Chicago, Illinois.

I. ATTENDEES

NAME	ORGANIZATION	PHONE
Gwen Massenburg	U.S. EPA Region 5	(312) 886-0983
Teresa Reinig	USACE Omaha	(402) 221-7661
Don Moses	USACE Omaha	(402) 221-3077
Rick Grabowski	USACE Omaha	(402) 221-7784
Janie Carrig	USACE Omaha	(402) 221-7754
Kathie Englert	USACE Omaha	(402) 221-7684
Rich Kapuscinski	ENVIRON International Group	(703) 451-2075
Joel Robinson	Bayer Polymers America	(412) 777-4871
Larry Hosmer	ARCADIS	(410) 987-0032

TELECONFERENCED PARTICIPANTS:

Jessica Huxhold Fliss	IDEM	(317) 233-2823
Steven Davis	IDEM	(317) 232-8854
Phil Schonhoff	IDEM	(317) 232-

II. AGENDA

Agenda items for the March 16 meeting included:

Introductions & Agenda Review

Objective/Purpose

Review of Proposed Remedial Components

Related Topics

Wrap-up & Action Items

III. MINUTES

Ms. Gwen Massenburg opened the technical meeting at 1000 on Tuesday, March 16, 2004 at the U.S.EPA Region 5, 6th floor Conference Room in Chicago, IL. Ms. Teresa Reinig recorded minutes. All action items resulting from this meeting are listed individually in Item IV. The following summarizes discussion of each agenda item that was discussed in the meeting.

Introductions & Agenda Review and Objective/Purpose

Each individual in attendance provided an introduction, including representation and role on the Himco Dump Superfund Site project.

Review of Proposed Remedial Components

Ms. Massenburg provided an update on the water analysis performed for one of the residents, Ms. Judy Moyer (27853 Westwood). A copy of the results of the analysis was provided to the attendees.

Institutional Controls for Groundwater Discussion

The PRP representatives verified their intent to invoke all laws to prevent well installation by all legal property owners for purposes other than groundwater monitoring. Research should be performed to establish the status of current institutional controls. The Department of Natural Resources maintains a well registry and the Elkhart County Health Department has regulatory authority for water quality. The PRP representatives will research the regulations pertaining to installation of water wells and the governing agencies/programs.

Ms. Gwen Massenburg noted that there are residents south of County Road 10 who are not on municipal water. Ms. Massenburg explained the history behind this situation. *Drinking water hook-up south of County Road 10 were not offered because the area was understood to be included in city limits and therefore, already on city water. Since we now know that some residents south of County Road 10 are not on municipal water, a survey should be performed to identify which residents are or are not on municipal water.* The opportunity to be hooked up to municipal water should be made to residents not already on city water.

Individuals at the following residences, 2559 (Jeremy Spice), 2569 (Marc Freeman) and 28507 (Juantita Smith) County Road 10, have inquired to USEPA about drinking water quality.

Domestic Water Supply Connections Discussion

PRP representatives expressed a concern that the line in the sand for action is moving. If contamination is detected, the PRP Group would seek recourse or buy-in that there would be no recourse back to the PRPs. It was noted that other upgradient source(s) exist, such as the airport.

Ms. Massenburg identified 39 residents (previously 38 plus 1 new resident identified) for municipal water hook-up. The USEPA request that the entire neighborhood, a total of 131 residents, be hooked up to city water. The trade-off would be a decrease in the scope of the groundwater monitoring program. A stepping out process was proposed to determine the hookup

locations. Also suggested was for the PRPs to offer to pay for the first six months of the 39 residents water bill. The representatives from the PRPs expressed an interest in obtaining a conditional bye from USEPA.

Groundwater Monitoring Plan

Mr. Rick Grabowski, USACE geologist, led the discussion for the groundwater monitoring plan. The discussion is summarized by the perimeter wells and the sentinel wells monitoring program.

Perimeter Monitoring Wells:

East Side of Landfill – USACE suggested the installation of monitoring wells at the following areas: one well cluster approximately halfway between the WT114 well cluster and existing monitoring well WTO1; and one well cluster approximately halfway between the WT114 well cluster and the location of abandoned monitoring well WTP1. The first new well cluster to the north would essentially replace WTO1, and would be situated in an area where historic bromide levels indicate the farthest northeast extent of groundwater quality degradation attributable to the Himco Dump Site. The second new well cluster to the south would be situated immediately downgradient of the southeast corner to the dumpsite where the highest soil gas concentrations were found. Existing monitoring wells to be included in the monitoring of the east side of the landfill include the WT114 well cluster.

South Side of Landfill – USACE discussed the possibility of monitoring some or all of the following existing monitoring wells: WT115A, WTE well cluster, WT119A, and the WT116 well cluster. The fate of the WT101 well cluster was not addressed. This well cluster could potentially be replaced by one of the proposed well clusters mentioned above. No discussions were held as to how far to the west monitoring should occur.

Sentinel Monitoring Wells:

East Side of Landfill – USACE suggested up to 3 locations for additional groundwater monitoring wells; however, no exact locations were identified. Well clusters would be required. The screen interval for the monitoring wells was discussed. Shallow monitoring wells should be screened across the water table. For deeper monitoring wells, it was suggested by USACE that in lieu of performing an aquifer characterization study to determine preferential flow paths (in a horizontal sense) within the aquifer that would require monitoring, that monitoring wells be installed at depths where residential wells to the east are pulling their water from. This would require performing a "residential well survey" to determine well construction characteristics and water levels.

South Side of Landfill – USACE discussed the expectations that at a minimum, monitoring wells WT105A and WT106A would be included in the monitoring well network. The need for deeper wells is questionable due to the fact that there are apparently no potential groundwater users to the south of the landfill (all on city water).

Perimeter Landfill Gas Collection/Treatment System/Landfill Gas Monitoring Plan/Landfill Access Restrictions and Related Engineering Controls

The PRP representatives were in general agreement with the concept Methane Gas – Passive Interceptor Collection Trench that was presented by the Corps of Engineers. The PRP team members noted that carbon treatment would not work for methane and that the geomembrane might not be required. IDEM was concerned that the trench may impede the flow of gas from the landfill and force gas in through the landfill surface. The USACE geotechnical engineer and the PRP representatives stated that this would not be a problem because the pervious fill that is a component of the trench would provide a sink for gas to flow to. IDEM wanted to further characterize the nature and extent of the methane gas in the landfill. Both the USACE and the PRP team members said it was not necessary to do this in order to design an interceptor trench. The methane gas emission rates have been previously accessed by USACE. It was stated that 5% methane was the average emission rate, however, there were several hot spots of nearly 50%. It was suggested that the PRP Group investigate these hot spots especially if the emission rates are detrimental to vegetation growth. IDEM proposed samples to be taken beneath the landfill cover within the waste material to ensure no unsafe levels of methane are generated. The Operation and Maintenance (O&M) for the landfill would be required.

Access control to the landfill is required. Institutional Controls would be put into place to prevent intrusive action. The PRP proposal included bollards at access roads to limit vehicular access. IDEM and USEPA disagree with the proposed use of bollards and require a more enforceable access control such as a site fence. The USACE geotechnical engineer, Mr. Don Moses, proposed efforts should be focused on restoring the landfill to create a vegetative surface, thus, creating an agronomically complete environment.

Landfill Soils and Landfill Deed Notices

Mr. Don Moses, USACE geotechnical engineer, stated that much of the existing soil cover could be adequate to prevent exposure with the landfill contents. The thickness of the soil cover should be determined based upon an agronomic evaluation of the existing cover soils and vegetation. It was noted by IDEM that the cover should also be designed to withstand erosion. It was recommended to the PRP group that they consider charactering the nature and extent of the existing cover soils. Three-foot deep exploratory holes should be drilled on a predetermined grid to characterize the cover soil types and thickness. The vegetative cover plant species should be inventorying at each grid point. This activity will require a sampling plan and health and safety plan. Sampling activities should include a visual log of each hole, particle size distribution (mechanical gradations) to determine soil texture and soil nutrient testing. A visual survey can be undertaken by the PRPs to remove surface debris.

A review of the current existing deed notices should be undertaken by the PRPs.

Construction Debris Area (CDA)

The PRPs proposed a one-foot cover across the CDA and utilization of institutional controls. USEPA and IDEM indicated that the one-foot of cover would be unacceptable and therefore other options should be pursued. The remedy proposed by USEPA and IDEM consist of complete removal of the CDA and reduce the liability issues. The main concern is the issue of property ownership within the CDA. All parties are interested in avoiding a "taking" of property. The PRPs would need to negotiate with each property owner. The three options discussed during the meeting included:

1) Waste remains onsite, install a cover, institutional controls, and O&M program.

2) Waste removal and restoration of site.

3) Fully characterize CDA, remove surface debris, restoration of site.

Again, unless the waste is removed, the liability remains. The PRP representatives proposed an alternative plan to remove waste and consolidate the waste from the CDA to the landfill proper. The plan would need to be negotiated with the property owners. This option would reduce the O&M aspect of the CDA and may require adjustment to the perimeter gas collection system proposed for the landfill proper.

Close Out

The discussions were finalized and Ms. Reinig was tasked to prepare draft minutes for review by USEPA. The PRPs will contact Ms. Massenburg to coordinate a revised proposal. If necessary, the next discussion would be by teleconference. On April 7, 2004 the USEPA redevelopment consultant will be canvassing the public for there interest and desire for reuse options.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1600 on March 16, 2004.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

Action items are listed below with responsible individual(s) noted in parentheses.

1. Prepare draft meeting minutes for review and distribute via email by Monday, April 5, 2004 (Reinig).

2. Provide follow-up information if an additional meeting is necessary (Massenburg).

3. Prepare revised remedial action proposal (PRP Consultants).

V. NEXT MEETING

The next team meeting is scheduled for April 8, 2004 in conjunction with the planned redevelopment meeting on April 7, 2004. The meeting on April 8, 2004 will require the attendance of legal representation for USEPA and the PRP Group.